

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.	:	10/605,904	Confirmation No.:	2903
Applicant:	:	Monica P. Felder		
Filed:	:	November 5, 2003		
Title:	:	Method and System to Manage Documentation		
TC/A.U.	:	2178		
Examiner:	:	David Faber		
Docket No.	:	014682.1		
Customer No.	:	44,870		

Mail Stop: AF
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF IN COMPLIANCE WITH 37 CFR 41.37

In response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated as mailed May 16, 2007, this amended appeal brief is being submitted. This Amended Appeal Brief includes IX Evidence Appendix and X Related Proceedings Appendix which were inadvertently omitted from the Appeal Brief filed on March 28, 2007.

I. Real Party in Interest

International Business Machines (IBM) is the real party of interest.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no other appeals or interferences, known to the Appellants, or Appellants' legal representatives, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this pending appeal.

III. Status of Claims

Claims 1-12 and 14 – 36 are pending. The October 16, 2006 final rejection of all pending claims is being appealed herein.

IV. Status of Amendments

There were no amendments filed after the final office action of October 16, 2006. Applicant chose to proceed directly with this appeal. All previous papers filed by Applicants have been entered.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The present invention is related to managing documentation associated with development of a software product and preventing each owner or assignee of a particular book including documentation for the software product from having to review all of the line items corresponding to changes to the software product to determine which line items may affect the owner's particular book. The purpose is to prevent important details from being overlooked or lost and preventing technical errors in the documentation or books because of incomplete understanding of any of the line item changes to the software product by each book owner; the book owner not being able to understand how each line item may affect his book; the book owner being unable to fully consider all line items because of the large number of line items; or any combination of the preceding. The embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 14, 21, 26, and 32 provide these features.

Claims 1, 14, 21, 26 and 32 are the independent claims that stand rejected in the present application. Claims 2-12 are dependent claims that depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and stand rejected in the present application. Claims 15-20 are dependent claims that depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 14 and stand rejected in the present application. Claims 22-25 are dependent claims that depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 21 and also stand rejected under the present application and claims 27-31 are dependent claims that depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 26 and stand rejected under the present application. Claims 33-36 are dependent claims that depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 32 and stand rejected under the present application.

Claim 1 is a method. Claim 1 recites "assigning at least one book of a plurality of books to each of a plurality of writers as an owner of the at least one book by a user on a system to manage documentation, wherein each of the plurality of books includes documentation for a

software product.” This feature of claim 1 is described in the specification in paragraph [0013] lines 3-5 and in Figure 1A, block 102. Claim 1 also recites “assigning a predetermined number of line items to each writer by the user on the system to manage documentation to prevent the owner of each book from having to review all of the line items to determine which line items affect the owner’s at least one book, wherein each line item corresponds to a change in the software product.” This feature of claim 1 is described in paragraph [0013] lines 5-8 and in block 104 of Figure 1A. Claim 1 also recites “reviewing and investigating each line item” which is described in the specification in paragraph [0013] lines 12-14 and illustrated in Figure 1A in block 106. Claim 1 further recites “performing any changes related to each assigned line item across all affected books by the writer assigned to the line item.” This feature of the present invention is described in paragraph [0013] lines 16-18 and illustrated in Figure 1A in block 108.

Independent claim 14 is a method claim and recites similar features to independent claim 1. Additionally, claim 14 recites the feature “reviewing and investigating each assigned line item” and “performing any changes for each line item across all affected books” which are described in the specification in paragraph [0015] lines 10-12 and in Figure 1B in block 116. Claim 14 further recites “reviewing any changes for each line item across all books; and closing each line item in response to review and approval of all changes related to the line item across all books” which is described in paragraph [0015] lines 10-21 of the specification and is illustrated in blocks 116 and 120 of Figure 1B.

Independent claim 21 is an apparatus or system claim. The first element of claim 1 is a processor shown in Figure 3 as reference numeral 302 and described in the specification in paragraph [0020] lines 3-5. As recited in independent claim 21 the processor tracts each line item of a plurality of line items. As previously discussed, each line item corresponds to a change in a software product and a predetermined number of line items are assigned to each writer of a plurality of writers. Claim 21 also includes a memory system illustrated in Figure 3 by reference numeral 304 and as described in the specification in paragraph [0020] lines 5-7 and 16-19. The system memory 304 stores a plurality of books, wherein each of the plurality of books includes documentation for the software product and each of the plurality of books is accessible to perform any changes related to each line item affecting any of the plurality of books as recited in independent claim 21.

Claim 21 also includes a module to assign at least one book of the plurality of books to each of the plurality of writers as an owner of the at least one book by a user of the system to manage documentation. As described in the specification in paragraph [0020] line 3-4 elements or features of the method 100 may be embodied or carried out by the system 300. Block 102 of the method 100 in Figure 1 provides for assigning each writer ownership of a selected number of books. Additionally, this feature of the present invention is described in paragraph [0013] lines 3-5.

Independent claim 21 also comprises a module to assign the predetermined number of line items to each writer by the user of the system to manage documentation to prevent the owner of each book from having to review all of the line items to determine which line items affect the owner's at least one book. As previously discussed, the system 300 in Figure 3 may embody the elements or the features of method 100 in Figure 1 and the method 100 includes a block or module 104 for assigning each writer a predetermined number of line items as also described in the specification in paragraph [0013] lines 5-8.

Independent claim 26 is an apparatus of system claim and recites similar features to independent claim 21. Additionally, claim 26 includes means for accessing and performing any changes related to each line item across all affected books associated with the software product. Figure 3 illustrates a browser 320 and a network 318 through which a writer/user 306 may access and perform any changes related to each line item across all affected books associated with the software product as described in the specification in paragraph [0021] lines 5-7.

Independent claim 32 is a computer product or computer medium claim and recites similar features to independent claim 1. Additionally, independent claim 32 recites tracking each line item as illustrated in block or module 112 of Figure 1A and as described in the specification in paragraph [0014] lines 1-5. Independent claim 32 further recites facilitating any changes related to each line item across any affected books associated with the software product. This feature is illustrated in Figure 1A by module or block 108 and is described in the specification in paragraph [0013] lines 16-18.

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Claims 1-3, 7-12, 14-15, 18-20, 26, and 30-31 stand rejected from the Final Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody et al. (U.S. Patent 5,890,177; hereinafter “Moody”), in further view of Plantz et al. (U.S. Patent 6,088,702; hereinafter “Plantz”), in further view of Ehrman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,610,103; hereinafter “Ehrman”).
2. Claims 4-5, 16-17, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody, in further view of Plantz, in further view of Ehrman, and in further view of Microsoft, “Release Notes for Windows XP Service Pack 1 and Service Pack 1a, published 9/9/2003 (hereinafter “Release Notes for Windows XP”).
3. Claims 6, 21-22, and 32-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody, in further view of Plantz, in further view of Ehrman, and in further view of Online Training Solutions, Inc., “Microsoft Office Word 2003 Step by Step,” published 9/24/2003 (hereinafter “Online Training Solutions”).
4. Claims 23-25, and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody, in further view of Plantz, in further view of Ehrman, in further view of Online Training Solutions, and in further view of the Release Notes for Windows XP.

VII Arguments

Turning initially to the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-12, 14-15, 18-20, 26, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody in view of Plantz, and in further view of Ehrman. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 does not follow the M.P.E.P. §706.02(j) which states:

“After indicating that the rejection is under 35 U.S.C. §103, the examiner should set forth in the Office Action: . . . (B) the difference or differences in the claim over the applied reference(s), (C) the proposed modification of the applied reference(s) necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and (D) an explanation of why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made would have been motivated to make the proposed modification . . . The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of the success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure." *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir.1991).

As discussed in detail below, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Moody, Plantz or Ehrman that their teachings may be combined so as to provide the present invention as recited in the claims and such motivation only comes from Applicant's disclosure. This approach constitutes impermissible hindsight and must be avoided. As clearly shown in Figure 3 of Moody, Moody teaches comparing edits to the same portions of a copy of a single document by different editors. Moody with reference to Figure 3 recites in column 6, lines 18-28:

"In a preferred embodiment, the paragraphs in a paragraph set are displayed in physical adjacent locations on a display screen. For example if it is found that an original paragraph 1 in the document 300 corresponds to an edited paragraph in document 302, the original paragraph 310 (which may or may not be edited) is displayed physically adjacent to the edited document copy 1 paragraph 1 (312). The three paragraphs in the paragraph set indicated schematically by dotted box 314 are not only displayed together but are also marked in some manner (such as by appending a number of paragraph tags), both internally and externally to indicate that they are part of a set."

Additionally, Moody in column 4, lines 37-41 recites:

"The author and each of the editors can then edit his own individual copy of the document using word processing programs such as the aforementioned WordPro[®] Word Processing Program."

In contradistinction to Moody, Plantz teaches a group publishing system wherein the administrator has the ability to assign different chapters to authors as recited in Column 11, lines 29-30 of Plantz:

"...; 312 allows the administrator to assign chapters to authors as well as review topics currently assigned to the author and topics that have not yet been assigned..."

Applicant respectfully submits that Moody teaches away from assigning different chapters of a book to different editors as taught by Plantz because Moody wants to compare edits by different editors to the same portions of a document as discussed above.

Page 5 of the Office Action further asserted that it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Moody and Plantz since it would provide the benefit of assigning work that eliminates the use of repetition reviewing and lessening the time and performance cost by avoiding more than one author or editor reviewing the same number of line items. Applicant respectfully submits that this is contrary to the teachings of Moody as just discussed. Moody wants review of the same document by multiple editors so that they can be compared and produce a consolidated document as clearly illustrated in Figure 3 of Moody and as described in the disclosure of Moody beginning in column 4, lines 64 and continuing in columns 5 and 6.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Plantz with Moody.

The final Office Action on page 5 states that Moody and Plantz fail to specifically disclose that each line item corresponds to a change in a software product and that each of the plurality of books includes documentation for a software product. The Office Action cites Ehrman for this deficiency in Moody and Plantz and asserts that Ehrman discloses informational text describing the updates and fixes and their effects on the based software product. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Ehrman, Moody or Plantz that their teachings may be combined so as to provide the embodiments of the present invention as recited in the claims and such motivation only follows from a reading of Applicant's disclosure. This constitutes improper hindsight under MPEP §706.02(j) and is to be avoided. Ehrman in column 2, lines 39-43 recites:

“The present invention discloses a method, apparatus and article of manufacture for providing informational text describing the updated and fixes of a program temporary fix (PTF) wherein the informational text is embedded within the PTF.”

Accordingly, Ehrman teaches that the informational text is embedded in the program temporary fix. Applicant respectfully submits that Ehrman teaches away from a plurality of books including documentation for the software product as provided by the present invention as

recited in independent claims 1, 14, 21, 26, and 32. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Ehrman with Moody and Plantz.

Additionally, as previously discussed, Moody teaches a method and apparatus for comparing and consolidating edits to multiple copies of a single document using a word processing program and Plantz teaches a group publishing system for permitting coordinated publishing, assembly and administration of text by an unlimited number of authors or editors each of whom may be performing word processing, document assembly and editing functions. Accordingly, neither Moody nor Plantz are related in any way to software development or documentation of modifications made to a base software product as taught by Ehrman, and Ehrman has no relationship to group publishing or editing by multiple editors to derive a consolidated document as respectively taught by Plantz and Moody. Applicant respectfully submits that Plantz and Moody are from a different field of endeavor from Ehrman. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Ehrman with either Moody or Plantz, and such motivation can only come from a reading of Applicant's disclosure.

Even if it were proper to combine the teaching of Moody, Plantz and Ehrman, they still would not provide the present invention as recited in the claims. Claim 1 recites:

“assigning at least one book of a plurality of books to each of a plurality of writers as an owner of the at least one book by a user on a system to manage documentation, wherein each of the plurality of books includes documentation for a software product;

assigning a predetermined number of line items to each writer by the user on the system to manage documentation to prevent the owner of each book from having to review all of the line items to determine which line items affect the owner's at least one book, wherein each line item corresponds to a change in the software product...”

The Office Action asserted that Moody discloses a method comprising assigning at least one book of a plurality of books to each of a plurality of writers as an owner of the at least one book by a user on a system to manage documentation. Applicant respectfully submits that Moody teaches assignment of copies of the same original document to multiple editors as clearly illustrated in Figure 2A and recited in Column 4, lines 32-40:

“Accordingly, the author makes three copies, 202, 204 and 206, of the document 200 as shown in FIG. 2A. These copies are then transmitted to the three editors, Editor A, Editor

B and Editor C. The copies can be transmitted over a local area network, via the internet, e-mail or simply placed on a floppy disk and given to the editors.

The author and each of the editors can then edit his own individual copy of the document using word processing programs, such as the aforementioned WordPro® word processing program. The individual editors need not use the same word processing program in order to use the principles of the present invention.

After each of the editors and the author have edited the original document, the author is ready to consolidate the edited copies to produce the final document.” (emphasis added)

Accordingly, Moody teaches away from assigning at least one book of a plurality of books to each of a plurality of writers as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, Moody does not teach or suggest that each of the plurality of books includes documentation for a software product. As previously discussed, Ehrman was cited for disclosing informational text describing the updates and fixes and their effects on a base software product to overcome this deficiency of Moody and Plantz. However, Ehrman teaches that the informational text is embedded within the program temporary fix (PTF) which teaches away from a plurality of books including the documentation for a software product as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in claim 1 (Ehrman Column 2, lines 39-43 as recited above).

Additionally, as admitted on page 4 of the Final Office Action, Moody fails to specifically disclose assigning a predetermined number of line items... to prevent the owner of each book from having to review all of the line items to determine which line items affect the owner's at least one book. The Examiner asserts that Plantz discloses a group publishing system wherein the administrator has the ability to assign chapters to authors, wherein the author has the ability to edit sections. As previously discussed, Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Plantz with Moody. Moody teaches comparing edited copies of the same portions of a single document by different editors as indicated in Column 6, lines 18-28 of Moody with reference to Figure 3. Column 6, lines 18-28 of Moody are recited above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Moody teaches away from assigning different chapters of a book to different editors as taught by Plantz as indicated in the Office Action on page 4.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that line items corresponding to a change in a software product are patentably distinguishable from lines of text in the document of Moody or Plantz, and Ehrman does not teach or suggest the feature of line items corresponding to changes in a software product. Ehrman merely teaches information text embedded in the program temporary fix.

The Final Office Action further asserted that Moody teaches “reviewing and investigating each assigned line item” as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in claim 1. Moody in column 4, lines 37-41 recites: “the author and each of the editors can then edit his own individual copy of the document using word processing programs such as the aforementioned WordPro® Word Processing Program.” Accordingly, Moody teaches editing using a word processing program which involves actually making revisions to text. Moody does not teach or suggest reviewing and investigating a software change (line item as defined in claim 1) to a software product to determine whether the line item affects the owner’s book including documentation on the software product.

The Final Office Action further asserted that Moody teaches performing any changes related to each assigned line item across all affected books by the writer assigned the line item. Applicant respectfully submits that this ignores the limitation in claim 1 that a line item corresponds to a change in the software product not to a line of text as in Moody and also that the change is made to all affected books and not to the assigned line item. In Moody the changes are made to the lines of text which Applicant respectfully submits the line items of the present invention are distinguishable from lines of text in Moody.

For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Moody, Plantz and Ehrman, whether considered individually or combined. Accordingly, Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 14, 26 and 32 recited similar features to independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are also patentably distinguishable over Moody, Plantz and Ehrman, for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of these claims is also respectfully solicited.

Regarding the rejection of claims 2-3, 7-12, 15, 18-20, and 30-31, these claims contain additional features which further patentably distinguish over Moody, Plantz, and Ehrman. Additionally, claims 2-3 and 7-12 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, claim 15 and claims 18-20 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 14, and claims 30-31 depend directly from independent claim 26. Because of these dependencies, these claims contain all of the features of the referenced independent claims. Accordingly, these claims are also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Moody, Plantz and Ehrman, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of these claims is respectfully solicited.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 4-5, 16-17, and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody, in further view of Plantz, in further view of Ehrman and in further view of the Release Notes for Windows XP. As previously discussed, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Moody, Plantz and Ehrman. Additionally, claim 4-5, 16-17, and 27-29 recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over the cited documents. Further, claims 4-5 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, claims 16-17 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 14 and claims 27-29 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 26. As a result of these dependencies, these claims contain all of the features of the referenced independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the Release Notes for Windows XP adds nothing to the teachings of Moody, Plantz and Ehrman so as to render independent claims 1, 14 and 26 unpatentable. Therefore, claims 4-5, 16-17, and 27-29 are also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the cited documents, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 4-5, 16-17, and 27-29 is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 6, 21-22, and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody, in further view of Plantz, in further view of Ehrman and in further view of Online Training Solutions, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Considering

initially the rejection to dependent claim 6, claim 6 recites "tracking line items and changes related to the line items." The Office Action admits that Moody, Plantz and Ehrman fail to specifically disclose this feature of the present invention. Online Training Solutions was cited for disclosing a method in Microsoft Word that tracks changes made to lines of text in a document. Applicant respectfully submits that tracking line items and changes related to line items which correspond to changes in a software product are patentably distinguishable from the track changes features of Microsoft Word. Additionally, claim 6 depends directly from independent claim 1, and by virtue of this dependency, claim 6 contains all of the features of independent claim 1. For all of these reasons, claim 6 is submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the cited documents, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the rejection of independent claim 21, claim 21 recites similar features to independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Online Training Solutions adds nothing to the teachings of Moody, Plantz and Ehrman so as to render claim 1 and claim 21 unpatentable. Therefore, claim 21 is submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the cited documents for the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of independent claim 21 is respectfully solicited.

Regarding the rejection of dependent claim 22, claim 22 depends directly from independent claim 21. Because of this dependency, claim 22 contains all of the features of claim 21. Therefore, claim 22 is also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the cited documents, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claim 22 is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the rejection of independent claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody, in further view of Plantz, in further view of Ehrman, and in further view of Online Training Solutions, claim 32 recites similar features to independent claim 1. Additionally, claim 32 recites "tracking each line item." As previously discussed, Applicant respectfully submits that tracking each line item which corresponds to a change in a software product is distinguishable from tracking changes in Microsoft Word. Therefore, independent claim 32 is submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the documents of record, and

reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of claim 32 is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 23-25, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody, in further view of Plantz, in further view of Ehrman, in further view of Online Training Solutions, and in further view of Release Notes for Windows XP, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over the documents of record. Additionally, claims 23-25 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 21, and claims 34-36 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 32. Because of these dependencies, these claims contain all of the features of the referenced claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the Release Notes for Windows XP adds nothing to the teachings of Moody, Plantz, Ehrman and Online Training Solutions so as to render independent claims 21 and 32 unpatentable. Accordingly, claims 23-25 and 34-36 are also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the documents of records, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections standing in this application are improper. The Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to claims 1-12 and 14-36 over the cited documents. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12 and 14-36 are in condition for allowance. Reversal of the rejection of claims 1-12 and 14-36 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Monica P. Felder

(Applicant)

Date: May 22, 2007

By: 

Charles L. Moore

Registration No. 33,742

Moore & Van Allen PLLC

P.O. Box 13706

Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709

Telephone: (919) 286-8000

Facsimile: (919) 286-8199

VIII. Claims Appendix

1. (Previously Amended) A method to manage documentation, comprising:

assigning at least one book of a plurality of books to each of a plurality of writers as an owner of the at least one book by a user on a system to manage documentation, wherein each of the plurality of books includes documentation for a software product;

assigning a predetermined number of line items to each writer by the user on the system to manage documentation to prevent the owner of each book from having to review all of the line items to determine which line items affect the owner's at least one book, wherein each line item corresponds to a change in the software product;

reviewing and investigating each assigned line item; and

performing any changes related to each assigned line item across all affected books by the writer assigned the line item.

2. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising electronically accessing each affected book to perform any changes.

3. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein each change is performed across all affected books regardless of book ownership.

4. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising:

preparing a document including a description of each change for each book; and
storing the document in a selected location in a memory.

5. (Original) The method of claim 4, further comprising creating a pointer associated with each description of each change to link to a current version of the associated book.

6. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising tracking line items and changes related to the line items.

7. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising sending a notice in response to completion of any changes related to each line item.

8. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising sending a notice in response to completion of any changes related to all assigned line items.

9. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising reviewing any changes related to each line item across all books.

10. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising closing each line item in response to review and approval of all changes related to the line item.

11. (Original) The method of claim 10, further comprising performing a whole book inspection in response to closing all line items associated with the book.

12. (Original) The method of claim 11, further comprising correcting any structural, retrieval or usability problems associated with each book.

13. Canceled

14. (Previously Amended) A method to manage documentation in software development, comprising:

assigning at least one book of a plurality of books to each of a plurality of writers as an owner of the at least one book by a user on a system to manage documentation, wherein each of the plurality of books includes documentation for a software product;

assigning a predetermined number of line items to each writer by the user on the system to manage documentation to prevent the owner of each book from having to review all of the line items to determine which line items affect the owner's at least one book, wherein each line item corresponds to a change in the software product;

reviewing and investigating each assigned line item;

performing any changes related to each assigned line item across all affected

books associated with the software product;

reviewing any changes for each line item across all books; and

closing each line item in response to review and approval of all changes related to the line item across all books.

15. (Original) The method of claim 14, wherein each change is performed across all affected books regardless of book ownership.

16. (Original) The method of claim 14, further comprising:

preparing a document including a description of each change for each book; and
storing the document in a selected memory location.

17. (Original) The method of claim 16, further comprising creating a pointer associated with each description of each change to link to a current version of the affected book.

18. (Original) The method of claim 14, further comprising sending a notice in response to completion of any changes related to each line item.

19. (Original) The method of claim 14, further comprising reviewing any changes related to each line item across all books.

20. (Original) The method of claim 14, further comprising performing a whole book inspection on each book in response to closing all line items associated with the book.

21. (Previously Amended) A system to manage documentation, comprising:

a processor to track each line item of a plurality of line items, wherein each line item corresponds to a change in a software product and wherein a predetermined number of line items are assigned to each writer of a plurality of writers;

a system memory associated with the processor to store a plurality of books, wherein each of the plurality of books includes documentation for the software product, each of the plurality of books being accessible to perform any changes related to each line item effecting any of the plurality of books;

a module to assign at least one book of the plurality of books to each of the plurality of writers as an owner of the at least one book by a user on the system to manage documentation; and

a module to assign the predetermined number of line items to each writer by the user of the system to manage documentation to prevent the owner of each book from having to review all of the line items to determine which line items affect the owner's at least one book.

22. (Original) The system of claim 21, further comprising at least one input device to make changes related to any line items requiring such changes.

23. (Original) The system of claim 21, further comprising a document formable to include a description of each change for each book.

24. (Original) The system of claim 23, wherein the document is stored in a selected memory location in the system memory.

25. (Original) The system of claim 23, further comprising a pointer formable for association with the description of each change to link to a current version of the affected book.

26. (Previously Amended) A system to manage documentation, comprising:

means for assigning at least one book of a plurality of books to each of a plurality of writers as an owner of the at least one book by a user on the system to manage documentation, wherein each of the plurality of books includes documentation for a software product;

means for assigning a predetermined number of line items associated with a release of the software product to each writer to prevent the owner of each book from having to review all of the line items to determine which line items affect the owner's at least one book;

a system memory to store line item assignments and book assignments; and
means for accessing and performing any changes related to each line item across
all affected books associated with the software product.

27. (Original) The system of claim 26, further comprising means for preparing a
document including a description of each change for each book.

28. (Original) The system of claim 27, wherein the document is storable in a selected
memory location in the system memory.

29. (Original) The system of claim 27, further comprising means for creating a pointer
associated with each description of each change to link to a current version of the affected book.

30. (Original) The system of claim 26, further comprising means for sending a notice in
response to completion of any changes.

31. (Original) The system of claim 26, further comprising means for closing each line
item in response to review and approval of all changes related to the line item.

32. (Previously Amended) A computer-readable medium having computer-executable
instructions for performing a method, comprising:

assigning at least one book of a plurality of books to each of a plurality of writers as an
owner of the at least one book, wherein each of the plurality of books includes documentation for
a software product;

assigning a predetermined number of line items to each writer to prevent the owner of
each book from having to review all of the line items to determine which line items affect the
owner's at least one book, wherein each line item corresponds to a change in the software
product;

tracking each line item; and

facilitating any changes related to each line item across any affected books associated

with the software product.

33. (Original) The computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of claim 32, further comprising sending a notice in response to completion of any changes related to each line item.

34. (Original) The computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of claim 32, further comprising providing means for preparing a description of each change.

35. (Original) The computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of claim 34, further comprising providing means for creating a pointer associated with each description of each change to link to a current version of the affected book.

36. (Original) The computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of claim 32, further comprising closing each line item in response to review and approval of all change related to the line item.

IX. Evidence Appendix

None.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

None.